

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
EASTERN DIVISION

CANDACE ALEXANDER,
Plaintiff,

v.

JAMEKA SCALES, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-980-CLM

[PROPOSED] FINAL DEFAULT JUDGMENT

The Court GRANTS Plaintiff Candace Alexander's Motion for Default Judgment under Rule 55(b)(2). The Court finds as follows:

- Defendants were properly served and granted an extension of time but failed to file any proper answer or responsive pleading by the extended August 11, 2025 deadline.
- The allegations in Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 1) are deemed admitted under Rule 8(b)(6).
- The coordinated pro se filing (Doc. 8), followed by uniform noncompliance, supports Plaintiff's claim that Defendants acted jointly and intentionally.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

I. ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

Judgment is **ENTERED** in favor of Plaintiff Candace Alexander and against Defendants Jameka Scales, Corey Bennett, Patrick Bennett, and Vickie Bennett on all counts in the Complaint (Counts I through IX).

II. DECLARATORY RELIEF

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), the Court **DECLARES** that:

- The affidavit submitted by Corey Bennett on or about April 22, 2025, contained materially false statements, targeted an unrelated third party, and was used as a vehicle to reference and draw Plaintiff into the matter without her knowledge or consent. It was submitted in coordination with the other Defendants as part of a broader harassment campaign.
- The conduct of Defendants was not incidental or benign, it was retaliatory and undertaken to harass, manipulate, or undermine Plaintiff through misuse of legal process, timed emotional incursions, and group-based pressure tactics.
- Defendants' behavior, including affidavit abuse, triangulation, unsolicited contact during medical vulnerability, and social manipulation through spiritual or familial messaging, constitutes **predatory conduct** and presents a continuing danger to Plaintiff's peace, autonomy, and the protected boundaries of her minor daughter.
- Any future messaging, invocation, or indirect contact with Plaintiff or her daughter, under the guise of religion, family, or concern, shall be presumed coercive and inconsistent with this judgment.
- The coordinated efforts of Defendants created a **chilling effect** on Plaintiff's ability to disengage from toxic family dynamics, assert her boundaries, and engage in constitutionally protected life choices without fear of surveillance, guilt-leverage, or procedural misuse.

III. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

The Court **PERMANENTLY ENJOINS** Defendants Jameka Scales, Corey Bennett, Patrick Bennett, and Vickie Bennett from initiating or maintaining **any direct or indirect contact** with Plaintiff or her minor daughter, including but not limited to:

- In-person communication.
- Written, electronic, or telephonic communication.
- Contact through third parties.
- Inclusion in religious, familial, or social messaging intended to reach or affect them.
- Reference to Plaintiff or her daughter in prayer chains, online messages, family correspondence, or group communications that function as guilt-leverage or emotional triangulation.

IV. NOMINAL DAMAGES

The Court **AWARDS** Plaintiff one dollar (\$1.00) in nominal damages, **jointly and severally**, against all four Defendants, reflecting legal recognition of the injury and the validity of each claim without emphasizing financial restitution.

V. FINDINGS OF FACT AND LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

The Court makes the following **findings of fact and declaratory conclusions**:

5.1. Coordinated Harassment and Coercion

- Defendants jointly engaged in a pattern of unwanted, indirect, and emotionally charged communication.
- This included triangulation through third parties, coordinated silence, pressure messaging through religious language, and legal misuse via a false affidavit timed to destabilize.
- These tactics were undertaken in response to Plaintiff's personal, financial, and emotional independence, not in the pursuit of healing or reconciliation.

5.2. Boundary Violations Through Indirect Communication

- Defendants deliberately used religious references, third-party outreach, and spiritual pretexts to bypass Plaintiff's no-contact boundaries.
- Efforts to "invoke" Plaintiff through prayer, family messaging, or discussions about her surgery were forms of indirect control and surveillance, not concern.
- These efforts caused emotional stress and are declared coercive.

5.3. Targeting During Medical Vulnerability

- Defendants timed outreach during medical recovery periods in both 2022 and 2024, using spiritual guilt and indirect communication to destabilize.
- On April 22, 2025, Corey Bennett filed a materially false affidavit.
- On the same day (April 22), Patrick Bennett called Plaintiff in a coercive manner that attempted to redirect guilt and silence.
- The following day, April 23, 2025, Plaintiff initiated a group chat seeking clarification, and Corey responded with an aggressive verbal attack.

5.4. Predatory and Dangerous Conduct

- The collective behavior of Defendants reflects a deliberate campaign of psychological destabilization cloaked in family concern and spiritual rhetoric.
- The Court finds that their continued proximity, even indirectly, poses a **continuing danger** to Plaintiff and her child.
- These findings justify both the permanent injunction and declaratory conclusions granted herein.

VI. ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT

The Court DIRECTS the Clerk to enter final judgment accordingly.

DONE and **ORDERED** this ____ day of _____, 2025.

COREY L. MAZE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE